

ME Part B

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan (APR/SPP) is an accountability mechanism for states and school administrative units (SAUs) to provide a measureable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Each year, the state is obligated to report its progress toward the targets set in the SPP in an Annual Performance Report. The sections of the FFY2015 APR/SPP Introduction below describe Maine's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the public.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

244

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Schools in the State of Maine are organized into School Administrative Units (SAUs) as defined by Maine Statute, 20-A MRSA Section 1 (26): "School administrative unit" means the state-approved unit of school administration and includes a municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other municipal or quasi-municipal corporation responsible for operating or constructing public schools, except that it does not include a career and technical education region. Beginning July 1, 2009, "school administrative unit" means the state-approved unit of school administration and includes only the following:

1. A municipal school unit;
2. A regional school unit formed pursuant to chapter 103-A;
3. An alternative organizational structure as approved by the commissioner and approved by the voters;
4. A school administrative district that does not provide public education for the entire span of kindergarten to grade 12 that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;
5. A community school district that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103- A;
6. A municipal or quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;
7. A municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that forms a part of an alternative organizational structure approved by the commissioner; and
8. A public charter school authorized under chapter 112 by an entity other than a local school board. Throughout this APR, the terms SAU, LEA and district will be used interchangeably.

Child Development Services (CDS) is the governmental entity that serves as an Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) of the Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE). As described in state statute: The Maine DOE Commissioner, "shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a) (3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age." MRSA 20- A §7209(3).

The General Supervision System (GSS) manages and oversees the needs of children with disabilities ages birth to 20, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and overseen by the federal Office of Special Education Programs. GSS assumes the following responsibilities in seven components:

- **State Performance Plan (SPP).** The SPP is an accountability mechanism for the State and Maine school administrative units (SAUs), providing a measureable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of IDEA. Maine Department of Education (DOE) is responsible for the SPP. Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. The CDS Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director are responsible for the collection of CDS data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting CDS sites improving results for pre-school children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning). Outcomes also inform practices in professional development through the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) (e.g., LRE and postsecondary transition planning). APRs are published each year in order to document progress.

The requirement for public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. Public reporting for the preschool population is incorporated within the APR. LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to the SPP indicators. An overall determination is assigned to each LEA in alignment with the requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP): Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided, and define areas of required action and follow-up. The FFY2014 data profiles for LEAs are posted on the SPP website: <http://maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/leadeterminations2014.html>

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation. The State of Maine has policies, procedures and effective implementation of practices that are aligned with and support the implementation of IDEA. The policies and procedures include descriptions of methods the State will use to detect non-compliance and ensure correction of non-compliance when found. Effective implementation of policies, procedures and practices also addresses program improvement through planning, coordination, incentives and follow-up. Policies, procedures, and effective implementation or practices, aligned with IDEA, are designed to support program improvement and focus attention on specific areas of compliance and program performance as identified through an analysis of data.

Resources including links to the IDEA, Chapter 101: Maine Unified Special Education Regulation Birth to Age Twenty, Policy on Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP) Goals, and frequently asked questions are available on the following webpage: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/policies/index.html>.

- Data on Processes & Results. As a part of the State's general supervision responsibilities, a chain of events occurs when data for students receiving special education are used for decision-making about program management and improvement.
 - Collection and verification
 - Examination and analysis
 - Reporting of data
 - Status determination
 - Improvement

The Maine Department of Education's Data Warehouse puts data about Maine's schools in one place where it is easy to find and easy to understand. The Warehouse is a powerful tool for individuals who want to find out how their local schools are performing and how their performance compares to other Maine schools, districts and the entire state. The Data Warehouse also offers easily understandable data on Maine's student population, including students with disabilities.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) section 618(a) (for children ages 3-21) and section 642 (for birth through age 2) requires that states make specific special education data available to the public. Most of the data, including special education student counts and student assessment data, are available in the Data Warehouse. Links to additional 618 data are available on the following webpage: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/data/index.html>.

Targeted Technical Assistance & Professional Development. Targeted technical assistance and professional development enable Maine DOE and CDS to direct and impact the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures. Technical assistance, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is linked to the SPP indicators and outcomes for students. Technical assistance and capacity-building activities are implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, documents, coaching, mentoring, training of trainers, local, regional and/or statewide meetings and conferences, direct training from state personnel or from other resources.

- Listen & Learn Series. This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors and regional CDS directors in the field.
- Maine State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The federally funded SPDG is designed to assist districts in Maine in reforming and improving their personnel preparation and professional development systems that will result in improved long-term, sustainable and effective educational practices for children with disabilities. Initiatives on evidence-based practices for post-secondary transition, autism, and early childhood have been a major focus of the Maine SPDG.
- State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Maine's SSIP, entitled Math4ME, provides professional development on math content and evidence-based teaching practices to instructors who teach math to students with disabilities. Trained teachers additionally receive coaching during the school year from a Teacher-Leader who has received advanced training on math content and pedagogy. Details of the Math4ME initiative are described in Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report.

Effective Dispute Resolution. The timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required for complaint dispute resolutions. Effective Dispute Resolution addresses matters related to due process procedures such as mediations, hearings and complaint investigations. The due process team provides training for mediators and hearing officials, school personnel, agency personnel and parents. Technical assistance is available to school districts and parents.

- Due Process Hearing Decisions. Maine's Hearing Decisions (referred to as "complaint" decisions under the IDEA) are the opinions of hearing officers assigned to determine whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation result in a hearing order.
- State Complaint Investigation Reports. Maine's State Complaint Investigation Reports contain findings of Maine's Education Commissioner as to whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation typically result in a corrective action plan.
- Dispute Resolution Procedures & Forms. Guidance regarding mediations, individual and systemic State complaint investigations, and hearings is provided. Model forms with the elements required under the IDEA are also available.

Integrated Monitoring Activities. The Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services and Child Development Services implement the birth to twenty (B-20) General Supervision System to manage and oversee all aspects of effective implementation and integrated monitoring activities. Evaluations and interventions focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the Maine DOE Office of Special Services, Child Development Services (CDS), LEAs, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children, and on the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.

The Maine Department of Education monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every SAU in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance. The Department has certain requirements for monitoring activities for public schools, including charter school programs and regional programs, and also for special purpose private school programs.

Monitoring programs address the GSS activity of Improvement and Correction through the development of findings after the on-site and desk audit and implementation of the corrective action plan by LEAs and special purpose private schools.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- **Preschool Special Education:** Child Development Services implements CDS site monitoring, findings, and corrections, examining for compliance with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, and to increase and improve outcomes for identified children. All CDS sites are monitored annually, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings and determinations to all sites.
- **Public Special Education Program Monitoring:** Program review for all SAUs involves both desk audits and site visits in accordance with the General Supervision System, which includes:
 1. Program review geared towards correcting noncompliance with indicators in the State Performance Plan (SPP).
 2. Focused monitoring activities geared toward identifying solutions and activities to enhance and improve performance.
 3. Technical assistance geared toward identifying solutions and activities to enhance and improve outcomes for children receiving special education services.

Maine DOE has a projected six-year monitoring cycle. This cycle may also be used to assist the Maine DOE in planning and delivering statewide professional development and technical assistance. Each year, the General Supervision System on-site and desk audits for compliance monitoring include record reviews, interviews, and document reviews to identify noncompliance and assess growth toward federal and state targets for special education. Program review is a process which purposefully selects priority areas to examine for compliance and FAPE. The Maine DOE examines identified areas for compliance to increase and improve outcomes for identified children. The Maine DOE uses an improvement planning process to ensure correction of noncompliance that can be accomplished in a timely manner based on the development of the Electronic Monitoring Tool (EMT). Additionally, Maine DOE has joined a multi-state collaborative to develop multi-tiered systems of support that integrate performance elements into yearly monitoring and will move Maine DOE to a 3-year compliance monitoring cycle rather than the current 6-year cycle. The intent of this initiative is to focus more on student outcomes rather than solely focusing on compliance.

- **Charter School Special Education Program Monitoring:** Information and procedures for commission authorization of public charter schools can be found on the Maine Charter School Commission webpage: <http://www.maine.gov/csc/>.

The Charter School Commission collaborates with the Maine DOE, Office of Special Services to ensure that policies and procedures are in place to provide a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities according to the regulations set forth by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).

The Office of Special Services provides two years of individualized support as charter schools further refine their special education programs. After the charter school's second full year of operation, it is entered into a monitoring "cohort" with other public schools.

- **Special Purpose Private School Program Monitoring:** The Office of Special Services program monitoring is dedicated to improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Maine DOE continues to ensure that children placed in out-of-district placements, including Special Purpose Private Schools and hospital programs, are provided programs and services for children with disabilities as described by and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individual with Disabilities Act (IDEA). The requirements for continuing program approval for Special Purpose Private Schools can be found in the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER), Chapter 101, Section XII, 1.A-E.

Program monitoring of Special Purpose Private Schools occurs on a three-year cycle, and consists of both document submission and a site visit.

- **Fiscal Accountability.** The state system of general supervision includes mechanisms to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the state and local level. The State of Maine has procedures ensuring that fiscal resources are directed to areas needing improvement. The Maine DOE Federal Grant Fiscal Guidance (<http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/fiscal/index.html>) is a starting reference point to ensure fiscal accountability with federal and state regulations. Webinars and other resources are available to assist LEAs in the fiscal monitoring process. Activities are being developed to address and support LEAs determined to be high risk as a result of inadequate fiscal procedures that may be accompanied by additional programming concerns.
- **Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions.** Within the State's Integrated Monitoring Activities LEAs receive results of on-site and desk reviews of their policies and procedures for ensuring a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Findings of noncompliance are identified, LEAs are required to participate in a corrective action plan to correct noncompliance and participate in improvement activities to establish procedures that lead to positive outcomes for students (see Component 6: Integrated Monitoring Activities). Results of monitoring activities and student outcome data on the State Performance Plan are publicly reported on determinations made for LEAs every year.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Maine DOE and Child Development Services (CDS) provide a range of technical assistance to improve performance from minimal assistance to substantial interventions. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or state-wide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel or from other resources.

Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence based practice technical assistance and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect to professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide technical assistance that is cross-collaborative.

State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): The SPDG supports delivery of technical assistance by the Office of Special Services (OSS). The evidence-based practices used throughout the SPDG professional development complement LEAs' evidence-based initiatives in a multi-tiered system of support (e.g., positive behavioral interventions and supports, response to intervention). Evidence-based practice professional development (EBP PD) facilitates the development of leader teams within a region, focused on an area of need for that region. Training is provided regionally to ensure a broader catchment area in order to establish leader teams. Teams are made up of district-based groups that have defined the focus area as an area of need for their district. Through self-assessment and development of improvement plans, district teams improve their practice at their district and bring their expertise to their region. Then, as leader teams, they receive technical assistance via a coach trained in the area of development to continue their growth as resources to the districts in their region.

SPDG professional development resources and activities are available on-line. Teams and their regions have access to these dynamic resources. They include videos of live trainings, documents and guidance resources, and

5/19/2017 Page 4 of 55

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

collaboration tools.

Targeted technical assistance: As needs arise Maine DOE is able to direct the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures through targeted technical assistance. The department is informed of needs directly by districts, regional CDS sites, contracted providers, community members, families or the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC). Technical assistance is then designed to meet the needs of the LEA and can take any variety of forms, including on-line resources, documents, coaching, mentoring, and training of trainers or leader teams. In addition, Maine DOE regularly communicates with LEA's regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update.

Listen and Learn Series: This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is typically accessed by teacher leaders in the field, including special education directors, program directors and regional CDS site directors. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.

New Directors Academy: In collaboration with the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) Maine DOE presents a multi-day training for special education directors and CDS regional directors in the field for two years or less. Trainings are provided in August and typically follow an alternating year schedule. By working with MADSEC the department is able to respond to the training needs of the State.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Professional development, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is directly linked to the SPP and to the improvement activities. Maine DOE and Child Development Services State IEU (CDSSIEU) provides a variety of opportunities to impact performance from statewide activities to regional trainings, all with a purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs around the state.

Maine DOE Office of Special Services and CDSSIEU contracts and enters into working relationships with technical assistance and dissemination resources regionally and nationally to provide evidence based practice professional development (EBP PD) to educators and educator leaders, parents and interested parties. Maine continues to access support from the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) to improve indicator B-13 compliance. NTACT has also assisted in the dissemination of professional development addressing standards aligned IEP development. In addition, Maine DOE continues to use federal funds to support the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER). MAIER provides TA to leader teams that operate in the LEA's.

All contractors providing technical assistance to regional sites in the State are supported by national technical assistance centers in order to provide the most current practice available. All work done by contracted individuals must be consistent with Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) SPP and APR indicators as well as Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).

- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The federally funded SPDG is designed to assist districts in Maine in reforming and improving their professional development systems that will result in improved long-term and effective educational results for children with disabilities. The SPDG supports the State in establishing leader teams in the areas of autism intervention, IEP development aligned with standards and the least restrictive environment, and effective postsecondary transition planning. The initial work of the grant began in October 2011 and will be extended through 2018. The Maine SPDG consisted of five goals, four of which are directly related to students ages 3-20.

- Goal 1: increase the percentages of highly qualified special education teachers and related services personnel employed in the state.

Activities include increasing the qualifications of personnel serving children ages birth to 20 with autism by promoting the use of evidence-based practices work. Maine has continued to embed and integrate LRE evidence-based practices in its professional development to provide for newly certified special educator initiatives. As of June 2015, thirty-two (32) LEA teams have received professional development during Stage II EBP PD throughout the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years in the areas of data collection, implementation of evidence-based practices, and measurement of outcomes for children with Autism Spectrum Disorders and student access to general education and Maine's Revised Learning Results through the implementation of school-wide LRE practices. Autism Spectrum Disorders is one of the most challenging disabilities for Maine LEAs to provide services inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. The Maine Autism Leader teams establish and implement proactive and positive programming with fidelity for children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. To date, each of the forty-two (42) LEAs have completed two years of training and are disseminating evidence-based practices and serve as leaders throughout their region as well as their own LEA. In addition, seventeen (17) of the forty-two (42) LEAs have received two days of autism literacy training. Evidence-based practice professional development (PD) statewide continues to provide 42 district-wide Autism Leader teams with coaching support. Each leader team is comprised of general and special education teachers and administrators to promote access to general education curriculum and programming.

- Goal 2: increase the percentages of SAUs that improve Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) rates for children, ages three to 20, and the progress of children with disabilities in the general curriculum.

The Goal 2 Implementation Team, made up of community and education stakeholders, has participated in the development of a LRE Facilitated Discussion and Calculation tool to assist schools in using evidence-based practices (EBP) for LRE decision making at IEP team meetings. LEAs are identified as requiring intensive support based on not meeting the state target (65%) and being 1.5 standard deviations below the Maine LEA average for students in a regular classroom 80% of the time or more, or not meeting the state target (9%) and being 1.5 standard deviations above the Maine LEA average for students in a regular classroom 40% of the time or less.

This process identified sixteen (16) LEAs from 2012 child count data that participated in evidence-based practice professional development (EBP PD) provided during the 2013-14 school year to review and analyze their LRE decision making processes through the usage of the developed LRE tool. All Maine LEAs have since been invited to participate in professional development and the tool has been made available for their use. Evidence collected from all LEAs on the effectiveness of the professional development process and the tool itself will be used by the Implementation Team to ascertain the impact on the outcomes for children with disabilities.

Currently, two cohorts (14 SAUs) are targeted for technical assistance for evidence-based practice professional development (PD) to improve their LRE rates with access to general education programming resulting in better outcomes for student performance. Coaching is offered to each of these teams using a logic model and implementation science to institute systemic change in practice.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Goal 3: increase educators' knowledge and instructional usage of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English language arts and mathematics for children with disabilities.

This goal has a particular focus on general education curriculum. In Maine, academic expectations and "proficiency" definitions for public-school courses, learning experiences, content areas and grade levels are outlined in the Maine Learning Results which include the Guiding Principles, expectations for cross-disciplinary skills and life-long learning, and eight sets of content-area standards, including the Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics.

Activities are designed to increase the number of special educators who write and implement IEPs so that they are aligned with the CCSS in English-language arts and mathematics. This is accomplished by providing professional development for special educators and regular educators on the development of IEPs in alignment with CCSS in English-language arts and mathematics, and accommodations that support students in accessing the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

Currently two districtwide leader teams using a logic model and implementation science are working with coaches to promote supporting all teachers to work with all students. Each team participated in a two day institute designed to bring regular and special educators together to support one another. The usage of data, universal design and inclusive teaching practices were emphasized to promote standards-based instruction for post-secondary planning resulting in effective outcomes for all students.

- Goal 5: increase the percentages of SAU special education and related services personnel who can develop and implement effective, compliant transition plans and activities within timelines.

From 2012-13 through the 2015-16 school year, Maine DOE provided evidence-based professional development activities specifically designed to increase the percentages of LEA special education and related service personnel who can develop and implement effective, compliant transition plans and activities within timelines. In partnership with the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), Maine designed and developed a capacity building evidence based practice professional development plan implemented through the GSS activity of targeted technical assistance and professional development.

At this time the professional development will continue to support LEAs with in-depth, specific postsecondary transition planning to promote effective outcomes. In August, 2014 Maine DOE rolled out the new IEP format. This format, developed with stakeholder input, is moving educators in the direction of considering postsecondary transition planning at the beginning of a student's IEP development. In addition, attendance at national conferences confirmed alignment of these new processes with effective practices being used in other states. In the fall of 2015, Maine DOE provided onsite training to all LEA's assigned to the 2015-16 monitoring cohort. Additionally, the 2016-17 and 2017-18 monitoring cohorts will receive the same onsite training.

More information on the SPDG implementation strategies and activities is available on the SPDG webpage at: (<http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/spdg/index.html>)

- **Listen & Learn Series:** This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors and regional CDS Directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is made available to educators, special education directors, program directors, Child Development Services employees, and community service providers as requested. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.
- **Webinars:** Webinars are intended for a more specific audience than the Listen & Learn series (e.g. Excess Cost and Maintenance of Effort).
- **State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).** Maine's SSIP, entitled Math4ME, provides professional development on math content and evidence-based teaching practices to instructors who teach math to students with disabilities. Trained teachers additionally receive coaching during the school year from a Teacher-Leader who has received advanced training on math content and pedagogy. Details of the Math4ME initiative are described in Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☒ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. They bring to the table the responsibility of representation of their own field and community level stakeholders.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2015. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations and the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Target setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities amongst themselves and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Stakeholder input on the SSIP (Indicator B-17) is provided in the B-17 description.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

School year 2014-15 LEA determinations were reported to the public no later than 120 days following Maine's submission of its FFY 2014 APR. These determinations are posted on the following webpage: <http://maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/leadeterminations2014.html>

The requirement for public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. All LEAs receive and review on a yearly basis a letter with their determination status, the rubric "Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement", and the LEA profile. Data profile designs were developed for each Local Educational Agency (LEA) in the State. The profiles provide indicator-specific performance and compliance data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators. The individual determinations are then used to develop an overall determination with respect to the requirements of the SPP in one of the four required categories: Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided and define areas of required action and follow-up. A complete copy of Maine's SPP including revisions submitted with the FFY2014 APR is located on the following webpage: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html>

Data profiles for Part B 619 students are posted on the SPP website: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/publicreporting/index.html>

School year 2014-15 LEA determinations are currently posted on the SPP website: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator B11 – timely assessments. Maine's analysis of its data regarding timely assessments (B11) indicated that a primary factor in failure to meet timeline targets was the lack of contractors to conduct assessments for Child Development Services (Part B 619). Disaggregated data was as follows: Part B- 611 compliance was 93.25% for 2014-15 and 93.55% for 2015-16. Part B 619 data was 82.8% in 2014-15 and 81.43% in 2015-16. Combined data yielded 84.08% compliance in 2014-15 and 83.02% for 2015-16.

Maine accessed technical assistance from the former Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) which is now NCSI. Several of their consultants helped us with the issue of using a benchmark that was over and above what B11 measured. Maine was counting in its B11 compliance not only the completion of the evaluation but also the determination of whether or not a child has a disability. Maine revised its regulations to separate the timeline on completion of the evaluation and on the determination of eligibility.

CDS also accessed assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) because they wanted a statewide data system with real time information that would allow monitoring of B11 and other data. The result was the development of a multi-function data management tool called CINC that was implemented at the beginning of 2016-17. It is providing the ability to monitor more efficiently and to provide more real time assistance to sites to increase compliance with timelines.

Additionally, Maine has conducted professional development annually to help schools be knowledgeable about the timeline and to be effective in their adherence to timeline requirements.

Indicator B13 – post secondary transition planning. Maine has accessed numerous resources to improve results on B13 – post-secondary transition planning. Several national resource centers were engaged to help improve post-secondary transition planning and post-school outcomes. The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), now NTACT, provided significant TA focused on addressing B-13
5/19/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

non-compliance. Maine was invited to become a technical assistance state designated by NSTTAC to receive 2 years of intensive support, support for attendance at workshops, and on-site visits from NSTTAC consultants. While Maine is no longer in the 2 year technical assistance cohort because the period of availability has passed, NSSTAC continues to work with us and invite us to professional development opportunities. Other sources of support included attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) conferences and an Arizona state transition conference.

Beginning in 2012-13 and continuing through the current year, Maine DOE provided to LEAs professional development activities specifically designed to increase the percentages of LEA special education personnel who can develop and implement effective, compliant transition plans and activities within timelines. Supported by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), Maine designed and developed a capacity building practice professional development plan implemented through a general supervision system activity of targeted technical assistance and professional development. As a result of the intensive support provided by NSSTAC, Maine DOE developed and provided professional development to administrators, parents, special education and related services personnel via Maine's 2011 State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG).

To address the slippage that was evident between FFY2013 and FFY2014, Maine designed a plan that targeted its professional development efforts toward the special education directors, special education teachers, and related services personnel of the upcoming monitoring cohorts (approximately 1/6 of Maine's LEAs annually or 35-45 LEAs). As part of the plan, an NSTTAC-trained consultant and Maine DOE staff provided professional development at each high-school of the upcoming monitoring cohort. After training, each high school provided actual transition plans to receive feedback from the NSTTAC-trained consultant and DOE-trained staff. Once feedback was provided, the high school provided finalized transition plans for compliance evaluation. Based on the data collected on the level of compliance for B13, evidence of improvement was noted, including an increase in not only the compliance but also the overall quality of transition plans as a result of this targeted training. Based on the positive results of this professional development activity, subsequent cohorts scheduled for monitoring also received the same training from Maine DOE-trained staff.

Maine continues to access support from the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) to improve indicator B-13 compliance. NTACT has also assisted in the dissemination of professional development addressing standards aligned IEP development. An important goal of the professional development is to move special educators in the direction of considering postsecondary transition planning at the beginning of a student's IEP development and to explicitly connect IEP goals to transition plan goals.

Indicator 17 – SSIP. Maine's 2016 IDEA Part B determination included a reference to evidence based practices in Maine's development and execution of its SSIP activities. IDC worked closely with Maine because we were adopting a math project which had been developed by North Carolina under the leadership of one of the IDC consultants. Its efficacy and validity had already been demonstrated through North Carolina's implementation. We received assistance in understanding the program and determining the fit for Maine. We also designed our logic model with guidance from IDC. IDC also assisted in the alignment of the evidence based practice with the SIMR. IDC provided assistance on infrastructure planning and development and evaluation planning for the SSIP. IDC has committed to work with the Advisory Council and SSIP coordinator as the math project continues to evolve.

As the math project began to be implemented, Maine realized that there is a math consultant within the Maine DOE who is willing and able to partner with us in carrying out the professional development in the math project. Part of our decision-making process involved consultation with IDC on the ramifications of a change. IDC raised questions for consideration and answered questions that Maine posed. Maine also requested and received technical assistance from OSEP in its decision about the math project.

Unresolved findings. Maine had several findings from past monitoring that for various reasons both at the state level and at the federal level had never been closed. The areas of findings involved procedures to allocate funds using a correct formula, policies and procedures on excess costs, and maintenance of effort. Maine received significant technical assistance from the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), which sent consultants to Maine to provide TA, worked with us in on-line seminars, presented a national conference that addressed many of our needs, and provided frequent consultation via e-mail or voice mail. As a result, Maine has developed various policies, procedures and fiscal tools (e.g. maintenance of effort calculator, excess cost policy) that address all findings and are expected to close unresolved findings. Maine has continued to work on fiscal policies and procedures that extend beyond the problem areas that were the focus of past findings. Maine has been pleased to share nationally our risk-assessment process and tools and our maintenance of effort calculator. Maine has also provided technical assistance to its LEAs through bi-weekly webinars, presentation to local special education administrators, and workshops for local business managers.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data		74.30%	77.00%	76.00%	64.70%	64.70%	65.10%	66.02%	70.12%	70.38%	70.97%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets


FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-1 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,768	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,393	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	73.88%	Calculate 

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
1,768	2,393	70.97%	90.00%	73.88%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Calculations and data for the 2014-15 graduates are the same as those used for reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Starting in 2008-09, Maine moved to the new federally-required method for calculating the graduation rate known as the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate, or ACGR, which shows the percentage of students who entered 9th grade and graduated within four years. The purpose of the federal requirement is to use the same method across states and to provide more consistency in reporting and comparisons across states. It is important to note this rate does not reflect the students who graduate from high school in five or six years. It also does not include students who earn a GED.

For the graduation rate for the class of 2015, Maine compared the number of students who entered 9th grade for the first time four years in the fall of 2009 and received a "regular high school diploma" upon their 2015 graduation. For this calculation the denominator contains the cohort of all first time ninth graders from four years earlier plus all transfers into this cohort minus all transfers out (e.g., death, moving to another state). The numerator contains only "regular" diploma recipients from the four year cohort.

Maine does not have different conditions for graduation for students with IEPs.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.00%	3.50%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	19.83%	19.83%
Data		8.60%	3.50%	3.70%	3.80%	5.50%	5.50%	5.04%	5.50%	19.83%	18.55%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	19.80%	19.80%	19.00%	19.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-2 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,400	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	16	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	273	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
273	1,690	18.55%	19.80%	16.15%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Maine uses the same calculation as that used in 618 IDEA reporting (number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who exited special education due to dropping out/number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who left high school for the reasons listed below)*100.

The reasons for which students with IEPs may have left school are: graduating with a regular high school diploma, reaching maximum age, dropping out, and death.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data		95.33%								98.10%	92.96%
	B High School	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data										90.53%	62.43%
Math	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data		95.33%								98.05%	92.51%
	B High School	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data										90.58%	61.32%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3B from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3-8	15,163	13,703	92.96%	98.00%	90.37%
B High School	2,132	1,753	62.43%	98.00%	82.22%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The statewide reading and math assessments have changed twice in the three consecutive years from FFY2013 through FFY2015, changing from the New England common assessment (FFY2013) to the Smarter Balanced Assessment (FFY2014) to the eMPowerME assessment (FFY2015). With these changes, a great deal of media attention has focused on parents' ability to opt their children out of the assessment. This media attention began in FFY2014, and many more parents opted their children out of the assessment. Although high school participation has rebounded from the FFY2014 participation rate, participation in grades 3-8 has dropped consistently from FFY2013 through FFY2015.

Prior to the spring 2017 assessment period, Maine DOE sent letters to the Assessment Coordinators of LEAs requesting suggestions for best practices for improved assessment participation. Additionally, Maine plans to request technical assistance from OSEP-funded TA centers to improve assessment participation.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3-8	15,174	13,702	92.51%	98.00%	90.30%
B High School	2,129	1,751	61.32%	98.00%	82.25%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The statewide reading and math assessments have changed twice in the three consecutive years from FFY2013 through FFY2015, changing from the New England common assessment (FFY2013) to the Smarter Balanced Assessment (FFY2014) to the eMPowerME assessment (FFY2015). With these changes, a great deal of media attention has focused on parents' ability to opt their children out of the assessment. This media attention began in FFY2014, and many more parents opted their children out of the assessment. Although high school participation has rebounded from the FFY2014 participation rate, participation in grades 3-8 has dropped consistently from FFY2013 through FFY2015.

Prior to the spring 2017 assessment period, Maine DOE sent letters to the Assessment Coordinators of LEAs requesting suggestions for best practices for improved assessment participation. Additionally, Maine plans to request technical assistance from OSEP-funded TA centers to improve assessment participation.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FFY2015 assessment results are publicly reported at <http://maine.gov/doe/assessment/reports/index.html>.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY2015 data were updated on 4/25/2017 to reflect resubmission of the C185 and C188 EDFacts files.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2015	Target ≥					58.00%	66.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	35.00%	35.00%
			Data					35.00%	31.00%	31.00%	34.00%	32.60%	30.71%	15.79%
	B HS	2015	Target ≥					64.00%	71.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	20.00%	20.00%
			Data					15.00%	13.00%	17.00%	16.00%	13.80%	15.97%	17.82%
Math	A Grade 3-8	2015	Target ≥					50.00%	60.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	30.00%	30.00%
			Data					32.00%	29.00%	28.00%	29.00%	29.00%	26.02%	12.68%
	B HS	2015	Target ≥					43.00%	54.00%	66.00%	78.00%	66.00%	15.00%	15.00%
			Data					11.00%	13.00%	15.00%	29.00%	13.71%	15.69%	9.23%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	45.00%	60.00%	75.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	30.00%	50.00%	70.00%	90.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	40.00%	50.00%	70.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	25.00%	45.00%	70.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3C from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP’s recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3-8	13,703	2,071	15.79%	45.00%	15.11%
B HS	1,753	362	17.82%	30.00%	20.65%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
------------	--	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3-8	13,702	1,690	12.68%	40.00%	12.33%
B HS	1,751	181	9.23%	25.00%	10.34%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FFY2015 assessment results are publicly reported at <http://maine.gov/doe/assessment/reports/index.html>.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In the spring of 2016, Maine administered a new statewide assessment, eMPowerME. As the psychometric properties of this assessment differ from the Smarter Balanced assessment administered in FFY2014, performance on the eMPowerME assessment cannot validly be compared with performance on the previous assessment. Therefore, the FFY2015 values will now serve as the baseline performance values.

The FFY2015 data were updated on 4/25/2017 to reflect resubmission of the C175 and C178 EDFacts files.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-4A from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	230	0%	0%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- ☒ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
☐ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

State's definition of significant discrepancy: The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities:

- The district has to have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled
- The number of students with an IEP, suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1 student
- For districts meeting the conditions above, a district has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is more than 3 standard deviations above the State's suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4A: Data from the 2014-2015 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of long-term (>10 days) suspensions and expulsions. Out of 230 districts, only 10 had more than one student suspended or expelled for more than 10 days. There were 220 districts excluded from the calculations because they did not meet the requirements. As permitted by OSEP, Maine chose to include the total number of

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

districts in the State in the denominator. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days.

If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the State had (through the review of policies, practices, and procedures) identified policies, practices, or procedures that do not comply with the requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, it would have revised (or required the affected district(s) to revise) policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

☒ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The number of districts was prepopulated as 244, the FFY2015 value that was entered in the APR introduction. However, because indicator 4 uses lag-year data (FFY2014 data), Maine overwrote the number of districts, making it the 230, the FFY2014 value.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings**FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance****Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

☐ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

☐ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

☐ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

☐ The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:



- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
- ☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	230	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

State's definition of significant discrepancy: The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities by race or ethnicity:

- The district has to have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs and of any race/ethnicity enrolled
- The number of students with an IEP suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1 student of any race/ethnicity
- For districts meeting the conditions above, a district has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities of any race/ethnicity is more than 3 standard deviations above the State's suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4B: Indicator 4A data were further disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Out of 230 districts, only 8 had more than one student in a specific race/ethnicity category suspended or expelled for more than 10 days. There were 222 districts excluded from calculations because they did not meet the requirements. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days by race or ethnicity.

If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the State had (through the review of policies, practices, and procedures) identified policies, practices, or procedures that do not comply with the requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, it would have revised (or required the affected district(s) to revise) policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of districts was prepopulated as 244, the FFY2015 value that was entered in the APR introduction. However, because indicator 4 uses lag-year data, Maine overwrote the number of districts, making it 230, the FFY2014 value.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

- ☐ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- ☒ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥				62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data		57.10%	57.40%	57.00%	53.80%	56.00%	55.00%	56.00%	55.69%	55.67%	56.41%
B	2005	Target ≤				10.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
		Data		11.20%	11.60%	11.50%	12.50%	10.60%	10.80%	10.60%	10.80%	10.71%	10.70%
C	2005	Target ≤				7.17%	3.50%	3.30%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%
		Data		3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%	3.20%	3.30%	3.30%	3.29%	3.33%	3.10%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target B ≤	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Target C ≤	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-5 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	29,019	null

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,451	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,127	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	734	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	147	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	27	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,451	29,019	56.41%	67.00%	56.69%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,127	29,019	10.70%	9.00%	10.78%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	908	29,019	3.10%	3.10%	3.13%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
 B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥											
		Data											
B	2011	Target ≤											
		Data											

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥				
Target B ≤				

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Blanks in the tables above do not indicate a lack of data for this indicator. In Maine, children ages three through five are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)), and Maine reports data for the two environments separately. All data – the historical data, targets, stakeholder input, measurement description, and FFY2015 performance – are listed separately for CDS and Maine DOE in the attachment contained on this page (see Attachments section below).

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-6 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,512	null

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,641	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	18	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	8	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,641	3,512			75.20%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	26	3,512			0.74%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Blanks in the tables above do not indicate a lack of data for this indicator. In Maine, children ages three through five are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)), and Maine reports data for the two environments separately. All data – the historical data, targets, stakeholder input, measurement description, and FFY2015 performance – are listed separately for CDS and Maine DOE in the attachment contained on this page (see Attachments section below).

Additional Note: The values and the percentages (e.g. 75.20% and 0.74%) listed in the FFY2015 SPP/APR Data table immediately above are incorrect. These values should be null, but Maine is unable to overwrite these data fields. All data – the historical data, targets, stakeholder input, measurement description, and FFY2015 performance – are listed separately for CDS and Maine DOE in the attachment contained on this page. As noted in the measurement description above, the data for this indicator are taken from specific elements of the EDFacts data submission N089 – Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood. Those data were reported February 2016.

Children age three through age five are educated in two separate systems in Maine. Child Development Services (CDS) provides early childhood services for children aged three up to school aged five using a variety of placements within Maine's Early Care and Education System. Once school age five children are transitioned to kindergarten, they receive their education in public schools.

Because the environments establish settings and schedules that are significantly different from one another, Maine reports data for the two environments separately. FFY2015 shows that CDS met the FFY2015 targets. Additionally, Maine DOE met the FFY2015 target for 6B and was within 0.08% of the FFY2015 target for 6A.

FFY2014 Performance			FFY2015 Target			FFY2015 Performance		
	6A	6B		6A	6B		6A	6B
CDS	58.42%	4.53%	CDS	≥53%	<12.5%	CDS	58.36%	0.87%
School	99.30%	0.63%	School	≥99.2%	<0.8%	School	99.12%	0.54%

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites		
Targets	≥53%	<12.5%
CDS Aroostook	76.04%	2.08%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Reach	64.60%	0.00%
CDS First Step	46.02%	1.99%
CDS Two Rivers	61.87%	3.60%
CDS Midcoast	90.00%	0.50%
CDS Opportunities	44.04%	2.75%
CDS PEDS	59.17%	0.00%
CDS Downeast	73.58%	0.00%
CDS York	39.29%	0.00%
State Total	58.36%	0.87%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%
		Data					63.10%	60.90%	54.00%	51.00%	46.00%	60.04%	71.79%
A2	2008	Target ≥						37.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%
		Data					37.00%	37.00%	36.00%	40.00%	33.00%	52.46%	54.50%
B1	2008	Target ≥						66.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data					65.50%	59.90%	61.00%	61.00%	65.00%	68.55%	72.87%
B2	2008	Target ≥						35.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%
		Data					35.40%	31.30%	33.00%	36.00%	35.00%	50.69%	50.40%
C1	2008	Target ≥						58.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%
		Data					58.30%	63.50%	54.00%	59.00%	57.00%	55.05%	66.38%
C2	2008	Target ≥						51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%
		Data					51.00%	53.00%	48.00%	57.00%	51.00%	68.71%	69.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	39.00%
Target B1 ≥	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B2 ≥	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	37.00%
Target C1 ≥	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C2 ≥	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	53.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-7 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1201.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4.00	

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	288.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	316.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	347.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	242.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	663.00	955.00	71.79%	64.00%	69.42%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	589.00	1197.00	54.50%	38.00%	49.21%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	249.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	338.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	427.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	186.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	765.00	1015.00	72.87%	67.00%	75.37%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	613.00	1201.00	50.40%	36.00%	51.04%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	199.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	180.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	236.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	565.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	416.00	622.00	66.38%	59.00%	66.88%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	801.00	1187.00	69.20%	52.00%	67.48%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2
Target	64%	38%	67%	36%	59%	52%
CDS Aroostook	93.5%	73.3%	87.9%	58.3%	90.9%	78.3%
CDS Reach	55.5%	30.0%	62.3%	58.9%	52.1%	65.5%
CDS First Step	74.2%	59.7%	84.8%	58.3%	77.6%	74.8%
CDS Two Rivers	68.4%	64.3%	70.6%	53.9%	58.7%	76.5%
CDS Midcoast	77.9%	59.3%	80.5%	40.7%	71.6%	68.1%
CDS Opportunities	77.8%	56.5%	73.8%	47.8%	78.6%	72.5%
CDS PEDS	60.5%	69.5%	65.2%	48.4%	54.8%	67.4%
CDS Downeast	69.4%	40.0%	77.1%	45.0%	66.7%	60.0%
CDS York	77.2%	27.9%	80.0%	35.9%	69.6%	49.4%
State Totals	69.42%	49.21%	75.37%	51.04%	66.88%	67.48%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			86.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
Data		86.10%	87.40%	88.70%	91.00%	91.00%	90.00%	88.00%	93.90%	93.00%	93.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-8 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1010.00	1075.00	93.49%	91.00%	93.95%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

5/19/2017

Page 29 of 55

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

For the combined (school-age and preschool) percentage, the number of school-age and preschool respondents who indicated that schools facilitated parent involvement were summed and then divided by the sum of all school-age and preschool respondents. Preschool data (age 3-5) was gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites. School-aged data is collected through monitoring activities. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. The data for this indicator were collected during fall 2015 monitoring. Analyses of representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity were conducted, and respondent data was found to be representative of the populations of Maine's school districts overall.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

Maine reports preschool children separately in the breakdown. FFY2015 performance below.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

[(277 + 733)/(322 + 753)]*100= 93.95%

School Age = (277 / 322) * 100 = 86.02%

CDS = (733 / 753) * 100 = 97.34 %

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

School-age data was gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/6 of Maine's school districts. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites.

In FFY2015 Maine DOE staff mailed surveys by first class mail to parents of students with disabilities in LEAs; 5,600 survey invitations were mailed to parents of Part B school-aged children. For school-age children, a total of 322 responses were received, for a response rate of 5.75%. The data were electronically captured from each of the surveys. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 86.02%. An analysis of respondent representation by student gender and race/ethnicity revealed no significant differences from the statewide population of students with disabilities.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

Part B 619 data were collected in the spring of 2015. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey via a telephone call. 3974 Part B (619) families were contacted to complete the survey and 753 responded, yielding a response rate of 18.95%. This is relatively similar to last year's 19.2%. In reviewing the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the CDS system.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Part B 619 data are not based on a sample, they are collected via a census, while school-age data are collected through monitoring activities (a sample).

For school-age data, LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. Maine DOE staff mailed surveys by first class mail to all parents of students with disabilities in the monitored LEAs. 5,600 survey invitations were mailed to parents of Part B school-aged children, and a total of 322 responses were received, for a response rate of 5.75%. The data were electronically captured from each of the surveys. An analysis of respondent representation by student gender and race/ethnicity revealed no significant differences from the statewide population of students with disabilities.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	91%
CDS Aroostook	97.73%
CDS Reach	97.78%
CDS First Step	93.27%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	97.80%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	95.77%
CDS Downeast	91.67%
CDS York	100%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State Total	97.34%
-------------	--------

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data											
Baseline Data: 2005											
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Key: <div></div> Gray – Data Prior to Baseline <div></div> Yellow – Baseline											
FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets											
FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018							
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%							

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	244	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality are defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of special education identification of students of a given race/ethnicity in a district to the risk of special education identification of students of all other races/ethnicities.

Multiple risk ratio measures and an 'n' size criterion are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The 'n' size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in special education must be greater than 10 and a comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole) must also be greater than 10.

Maine's FFY2015 examination of disproportionate representation included all districts with greater than 10 students in any of the seven racial and ethnic groups (American Indian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic or Latino, and two or more races) who received special education and greater than 10 students in any comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district for which students could have been identified for special education).

For FFY2015, 100 districts in the State met the minimum population requirements for disproportionality assessments. There were 144 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the State-established minimum 'n' size requirement.

No districts exhibited significant disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014



Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data											
Baseline Data: 2005											
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline											
FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets											
FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018							
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%							

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	244	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality are defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of identification for specific disability categories of students of a given race/ethnicity in a district to the risk of identification for specific disability categories of students of all other race/ethnicities.

Multiple risk ratio measures and an ‘n’ size criterion are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine’s districts often are very small. The ‘n’ size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in a disability category must be greater than 10 and a comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole) must also be greater than 10.

Maine’s examination of disproportionate representation included all districts with greater than 10 students in any of the seven racial and ethnic groups (American Indian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic or Latino, and two or more races) in any disability category and greater than 10 students in any comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole).

For FFY2015, 96 districts in the State met the minimum population requirements for disproportionality assessments of specific disability categories. There were 148 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the State-established minimum ‘n’ size requirement.

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.00%	91.00%	94.60%	91.30%	84.90%	88.20%	86.40%	86.00%	83.24%	84.08%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,419	1,178	84.08%	100%	83.02%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	241
---	-----

Explanation of Slippage

CDS has shortages of qualified professionals to complete evaluations within established timelines. Additionally, a shortage of case managers means that CDS is sometimes unable to conduct timely initial IEP Meetings to determine if a child is eligible for special education services. We do have contingency plans in which non-case management personnel administer IEP Meetings to meet timelines. CDS will revisit the contingency plans.

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated within 60 Days (or State Established Timeline):

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	1233
(b) Number of children for whose evaluations were completed within 60 days	1004
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	81.43%

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff)	220
Provider	9

Delays beyond the time line					
Site	LessThan30	30_To_59	60_To_89	90_OrMore	Total
All Sites	166	51	11	1	229

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

- (a) Number of children aged 5-20 for whom parental consent to evaluate was received: **186**
(b) Number of children aged 5-20 whose evaluations were completed within 45 days: **174**
(c) Percent of children aged 5-20 with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated with 45 days (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100): **93.55%**

The 36 LEAs monitored received 186 parental consents for evaluation within the 30% of educational files reviewed. As indicated in the table above, 174 evaluations were completed within the 45 school-day timeline or within an allowable extension of time pursuant to Federal Regulations and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER). Acceptable reasons for exceptions to the timeline are those that are beyond the LEA's control, including repeated parent failure or refusal to produce the child for evaluation, excessive child absences, documented delays in making contact with a parent to schedule the evaluation, documented parent request for a delay, or the child enrolled in the LEA after parental consent was received in another LEA but before the evaluation could be completed. All twelve students included in (a) but not included in (b) had completed the initial evaluations, but not within the state-established timelines.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The delays across LEAs ranged from 1 days to 29, and the reason given for all delays was a lack of available staff to complete the evaluation.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ☐ The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- ☐ The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☐ State monitoring
- ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data-collection methods differ between students served under Child Development Services (CDS, which serves children ages 3-5) and school-aged students (age 5 and above).

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Data were collected from the State database for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Data were verified through comparison with monthly compliance reports generated and submitted by regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

School Aged (ages 5-20): The data for this indicator are monitoring data. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. Initial evaluation data were collected from the 36 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2015. LEAs submit the following materials:

- evidence of signed parental consent,
- completed evaluations for initial evaluations occurring during the 2015-16 monitoring period,
- school calendars for evidence of "student" days and "no student" days, and
- reasons for delay of completion of initial evaluations. LEAs are required to provide evidence of accepted reasons for delay.

The monitoring period is selected to ensure there are at least 45 school days between the date parental consent was received and the date evaluations were completed prior to submission due date. For larger LEAs this is a sample of initial evaluations occurring during the monitoring period. For smaller LEAs the submission consists of all the initial evaluations for which parental consent was received during the monitoring period.

Initial evaluation data is also obtained during site visits, during which 10% of the identified students' files are reviewed. Data collected on students whose files are randomly selected for on site review and received initial evaluation during the 2015-16 school year are identical to that submitted for desk audit; signed parental consent received by the LEA, completed evaluations and school calendar.

Data are reviewed by the public school program monitoring team and checked for accuracy and interobserver reliability.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	66.67%
CDS Reach	81.65%
CDS First Step	87.37%
CDS Two Rivers	91.30%
CDS Midcoast	80.56%
CDS Opportunities	51.72%
CDS PEDS	88.00%
CDS Downeast	71.43%
CDS York	82.10%
State Total	81.43%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
20	20	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) (achieved 100% compliance) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2014 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e (the CDS statewide database), performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that an evaluation and initial IEP meeting were conducted for each child aged 3-5 for whom consent was received, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrective action plans (CAPs). CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA.

The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was one year of identification of noncompliance. No instances of noncompliance remained after one year.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		97.00%	96.40%	100%	86.60%	91.70%	92.90%	95.00%	99.63%	98.89%	99.33%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	304
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	0
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	301
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	301	302	99.33%	100%	99.67%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	1
--	---

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

	Days_1_To_29	Days_30_To_59	Days_60_To_89	Days_90_Plus
All Sites	0	0	0	1

Reason for Delay	Count
------------------	-------

CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff) 1

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☐ State monitoring
- ☒ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 and verified by the regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on the review of these data.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites

Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	98.53%
State Total	99.67%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child referred by Part C, prior to age 3, who was found eligible for Part B, subsequently had an IEP developed, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities included providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						88.00%	47.00%	60.40%	36.00%	63.36%	54.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
137	154	54.29%	100%	88.96%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. The data for this indicator reflect direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the 35 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2015. Records for 30% of children receiving special education services in the monitored LEAs were reviewed through monitoring activities. The LEAs in the monitoring cohort performed a self-assessment of the records of 20% of their students receiving special education, and submitted the self-assessment to the Maine DOE. Maine DOE monitoring staff conducted on-site assessment of the records of an additional 10% of the LEA's students receiving special education to validate the data submitted by the LEAs through self-assessment. Postsecondary plans were evaluated using the postsecondary transition plan checklist developed by the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT). Findings of noncompliance were made in all instances and were identified both through self-assessment and on-site assessment.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
181	181	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2014 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans. Because transition plan information can be corrected, the LEAs were required to convene IEP meetings to revise the plans to meet the requirements in those cases where transition plans were found to be incomplete, or noncompliant. The amended plans with prior written notice were submitted to Maine DOE for review. When all instances of noncompliance were reviewed and found compliant the LEA's finding was closed.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2010	Target ≥							35.00%	25.10%	25.10%	25.00%	25.00%
		Data						35.50%	25.00%	17.40%	23.16%	21.34%	22.98%
B	2010	Target ≥							92.00%	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%
		Data						92.00%	76.60%	62.90%	48.00%	37.49%	62.12%
C	2010	Target ≥							94.00%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%
		Data						94.60%	82.30%	68.60%	82.64%	52.90%	89.38%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	30.00%
Target B ≥	76.60%	77.00%	79.00%	80.00%
Target C ≥	82.30%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-14 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1616.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	425.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	688.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	0.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	441.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	425.00	1616.00	22.98%	25.00%	26.30%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1113.00	1616.00	62.12%	76.60%	68.87%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1554.00	1616.00	89.38%	82.30%	96.16%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The student IDs of all qualified exiters were used to query the National Student Clearinghouse, yielding the total count and percent of all exiters who had records of enrollment in higher education. Sampling was used to estimate the count/percent of the total population of exiters who obtained competitive employment or some other employment. Employment data was obtained by querying the Maine Department of Labor databases for all qualified exiters who could be matched with social security numbers. The employment category percentages derived from the Department of Labor query were multiplied by the total number of exiters for an estimate of the counts and percentages of all exiters in the employment categories. The sample was assessed for its representativeness of the population of exiters with regard to gender, disability, and race/ethnicity. Across all categories, students in the sample were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population of exiters or were within 3% the population percentage.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data		57.00%	50.00%	60.00%	50.00%	25.00%	20.00%	50.00%	36.36%	0%	25.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-15 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	25.00%	58.00%	

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY2015 data listed in the tables above are not incomplete. There were 0 resolution session in FFY2015 and, therefore, 0 resolved through settlement agreements. Because there were fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2015, the State is not required to meet its targets.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data		83.30%	85.00%	83.00%	86.00%	77.20%	72.55%	68.52%	66.67%	75.86%	62.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-16 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	9	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	19	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	39	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
9	19	39	62.00%	85.00%	71.79%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		11.22%	9.00%
Data	11.22%	8.92%	15.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	16.00%	17.00%	20.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The math proficiency targets were revised with stakeholder input due to Maine's adoption of a new assessment in FFY2015. See SSIP Phase III report and supporting materials attached.

Description of Measure

The Maine Department of Education has chosen, as its SSIP, implementation of evidence-based professional development in the teaching of mathematics to improve the math proficiency of students with disabilities. The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) of this initiative and the evaluation of student-level progress is as follows: Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the statewide Maine Educational Assessment in the schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports proficiency as follows:

Percent = number of students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

For additional information, see the SSIP Phase III report and supporting materials attached.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☒ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

See SSIP Phase III report and supporting materials attached.

Overview

See SSIP Phase III report and supporting materials attached.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

The data and analyses used to formulate the FFY 2014 revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies are the same as those documented in Phase I of the SSIP (see Phase I data analysis).

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See Phase I for initial infrastructure analysis. Further developments and improvements of infrastructure are described in Component 1 of the SSIP Phase II write-up.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

State-Identified Measurable Result - Students with IEPs in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers participate in a research based professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy.

Description of Measure – Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports the percent of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math on the statewide assessment:

Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

Additionally, to identify potential improvement in math test scores that is not accompanied by a crossing of the score boundaries that define the proficiency categories, Maine will track student growth in the identified schools by assessing yearly changes in students' scaled scores on the statewide math assessment.

Description

With stakeholder input, Maine's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) and associated improvement strategies were revised in FFY 2014. Unlike the SIMR identified in Phase I, which focused on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools with specified achievement gaps between students with disabilities and their general education peers, the revised SIMR focuses on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools in which teachers volunteer to take part in a specific professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy. Maine DOE and Maine's SSIP stakeholder group discussed the revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies in the fall of 2015, and all members expressed a great deal of support. The professional development program that will serve as the primary improvement strategy for achieving the SIMR is discussed in Component 2 of the SSIP Phase II write-up. The Theory of Action and Logic Model that correspond to the revised SIMR are attached to the SSIP Phase II write-up.

Description of Measure – Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports the percent of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math on the statewide assessment:

Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

Additionally, to identify potential improvement in math test scores that is not accompanied by a crossing of the score boundaries that define the proficiency categories, Maine will track student growth in the identified schools by assessing yearly changes in students' scaled scores on the statewide math assessment.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

With stakeholder input, Maine's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) and associated improvement strategies were revised in FFY 2014. Unlike the SIMR identified in Phase I, which focused on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools with specified achievement gaps between students with disabilities and their general education peers, the revised SIMR focuses on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools in which teachers volunteer to take part in a specific professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy. Maine DOE and Maine's SSIP stakeholder group discussed the revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies in the fall of 2015, and all members expressed a great deal of support. The professional development program that will serve as the primary improvement strategy for achieving the SIMR is discussed in Component 2 of the SSIP Phase II write-up. Additionally, the Theory of Action and Logic Model that correspond to the revised SIMR are attached to the SSIP Phase II write-up.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

(1a) Improvements to State Infrastructure. The analysis conducted as part of Phase I of Maine's SSIP identified a number of infrastructure elements that could be developed or further aligned with SSIP activities to support LEAs in implementing and sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Building on that initial analysis, Maine plans to build capacity, expertise, and sustainability by leveraging and further developing the following infrastructure components:

- **Financial Support** – The primary financial resource that Maine DOE plans to leverage to support the Math4ME training, post-training fidelity assessments and coaching in LEAs, and long-term scale-up is the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), implemented by the Maine DOE Office of Special Services. SPDG funding will pay for expert trainers to provide professional development to participating teachers and provide advanced training to Teacher-Leaders, described below. Additionally, SPDG funds will provide up to \$10,000 to each school to cover miscellaneous costs associated with their teachers' participation in the project (e.g. cost of substitutes, travel, materials). The SPDG budget also provides funds over the course of 5 years for scale-up of the initiative to additional LEAs in different regions of Maine.

- **Foundations of Math Trainers** – Maine DOE will contract with the two developers of the Foundations of Math training to provide training to special education and general education teachers in participating LEAs. The trainers will also provide advanced training on fidelity of practice to Teacher-Leaders.

- **Teacher-Leaders** – Maine DOE will contract with one LEA in each year's cohort of participating LEAs to provide a teacher to serve as Teacher-Leader for the cohort. Maine DOE will provide the LEA with the amount of the teacher's salary, benefits, and miscellaneous costs to allow the teacher to be available for the Math4ME initiative. The Teacher-Leader will receive advanced training on fidelity of practice of the Foundations of Math program and will be responsible for fidelity observations, coaching of the trained teachers in the LEA cohort, and coordination of data collections necessary to evaluate program effectiveness for the cohort. Teacher-Leaders also will assist with scale-up and expansion of expertise and capacity in other Maine LEAs.

- **Math Content Specialist** – The Maine DOE Learning Systems Team recently hired a math content specialist specifically for elementary grade levels. This individual will participate in the initial Math4ME training and will join the SSIP Workgroup described below. Inclusion of the math content specialist in the Workgroup promises to offer a unique, math-specific perspective for evaluating the implementation and effectiveness of the professional development.

- **General Supervision System** – Monitoring of public school special education programs occurs as part of the general supervision system. Monitoring has historically focused on compliance issues, but Maine DOE has committed to the transformation of its general supervision system into one that looks at student outcomes such as proficiency in addition to compliance elements. Working toward this shift in focus to student outcomes, Maine currently participates in the TA&D Network Results-Based Accountability Cross-State Learning Collaborative to learn about other states' approaches to crafting results-driven monitoring systems. The inclusion of student outcomes in LEA assessments will inform placement of each LEA on a tiered system of supports that will address either compliance and/or the improvement of student outcomes. The inclusion of student outcomes in these assessments is a significant change in infrastructure that will inform and be informed by the work of the SSIP.

- **Communication Network** – Maine DOE communicates with educators and the public via weekly Commissioner's Updates. These emails originate from the Maine DOE newsroom and inform members of the listserve on current events within the Maine DOE and the field of education more generally as it relates to Maine. All professional development opportunities sponsored by or provided through the Maine DOE are posted on the Maine DOE Professional Development Calendar. These resources offer, among other things, evidence-based tools with instructions for use, recorded trainings accessible at any time, and live trainings to attend in areas of need or interest. Maine's communication network will be leveraged to publicize activities related to the Math4ME initiative. Additionally, to reach parents who might not be aware of Maine DOE's existing communication tools, Maine DOE will contract with the Maine Parent Federation to offer periodic informational presentations to parents regarding SSIP activities and the impact of those activities on students in general and special education.

- **Program Evaluation** – The Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI), housed at the University of Maine, has been contracted to conduct the external evaluation of the SSIP. For two decades, MEPRI has provided research, program evaluation, and policy analysis to Maine schools, agencies, and community organizations, as well as other university and community-based researchers. MEPRI researchers have expertise in quantitative and qualitative methods in addition to data collection and survey and instrument design.

- **Teacher Preparation** – The University of Maine system is the primary provider of preservice training for Maine's teachers. Teachers also use University of Maine system courses and workshops to further develop their skills and to pursue advanced degrees. Maine DOE has engaged education faculty members at the University of Maine who have expressed an interest in partnering to integrate components of the Foundations of Math training into the curriculum of education majors. Incorporation of such components promises to have a far-reaching effect in sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math across Maine.

(1b) Alignment of the SSIP Initiative with Other Improvement Programs. Maine's SSIP aligns with some of the most important and far-reaching of Maine DOE's initiatives – the Focus School/Priority School program and Proficiency-Based Diplomas.

- **Focus Schools/Priority Schools** – The Maine DOE School Improvement Team works with two categories of schools: (1) Focus Schools have the greatest gaps in proficiency between subgroups of students (e.g. students with disabilities compared to the entire school population) and (2) Priority Schools have low overall proficiency for the entire school population. Maine's differentiated accountability system identifies the professional development available to all schools, including those that do not fall into the priority and focus school categories but are eligible for Title I funding. Focus Schools receive coaching support using the Indistar system of leadership development. Coaches facilitate LEAs' self-assessments and use of data for effective improvement planning and implementation. The focus school/priority school coaches have been well represented in the development of the SSIP and will continue to consult with the SSIP Workgroup. Two of the schools selected in the initial Math4ME cohort are focus schools, and the focus school coach will work in collaboration with the Math4ME Teacher-Leaders to enhance both initiatives.

- **Proficiency Based Diplomas** – Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 207-A, Subchapter 3, Section 4722-A requires that all Maine students will meet standards in eight content areas to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2018. Work in this area addresses the shift to demonstration of proficiency in content standards, putting achievement of standards behind the diploma. Content specialists are supporting schools in the implementation of the revised Maine Learning Results which incorporate the Common Core State Standards for mathematics and English language arts. The Special Services General Education/Special Education Liaison supports the content specialists and schools in universal designs for learning, multiple pathways for demonstration of proficiency, and standards-aligned IEP goal development. Many LEAs have applied for and been awarded extensions to the proficiency based diploma as far out as 2020-21. Substantial professional development regarding proficiency-based education has been offered to support LEAs in their implementation of the laws. The Math4ME project is an important professional development activity that will help all educators serving student with disabilities acquire the content knowledge and skills necessary to support math proficiency for all students.

(1c) SSIP Administration and Resources. A cross-division SSIP Workgroup has been created at Maine DOE to translate the ideas that arise in discussions with stakeholders, technical assistance personnel, evaluators, trainers, and others into suggestions and formulate decision points regarding the SSIP and to forge linkages between initiatives across DOE divisions. The workgroup represents a variety of perspectives and divisions across Maine DOE and consists of the Maine DOE Special Education Director, the SSIP Coordinator, the Federal Programs Coordinator, the Special Purpose Private School Coordinator, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, and the IDEA Part B Data Manager. Moving forward, Maine DOE's newly-hired elementary-school math content expert will also join the workgroup. The group will meet regularly to assess implementation progress, evaluate outcomes, and discuss ways in which Maine DOE and other state agencies can best support LEAs in the development, scale-up, and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices in the teaching of math.

Additionally, Maine DOE personnel, including members of the SSIP Workgroup, will continue to meet with the full stakeholder group throughout the length of the SSIP. These meetings will be used to examine implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit stakeholder feedback, and address ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. An important function of the group will be to proactively

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

advise on the acquisition of resources necessary to engage each new LEA cohort. Resource and timeline considerations will involve yearly solicitation of applications from LEAs wishing to participate in the professional development, contracting with LEAs for new Teacher-Leaders, and contracting with trainers. The inclusion of the SSIP initiative as one of the SPDG-funded professional development goals is a substantial benefit for the acquisition of SSIP resources. Maine has budgeted SPDG funds to ensure that SSIP-related contracts with LEAs, trainers, and external evaluators can be funded through 2020. Sustainability of evidence-based practices in the teaching of math beyond the SPDG-funded time-frame will include the integration of Math4ME professional development elements into teacher preparation programs at the University of Maine System.

1(d) Involvement of Multiple Offices and Agencies. Maine DOE divisions have significantly increased their collaborations over the past several years, creating overlap and cross-team activities. It is clear that the working relationships within Maine DOE have been changing to include more frequent conversation and collaboration to assist LEAs in their work with students with and without disabilities. For example, the Office of Special Services has worked closely with the math specialists on Maine DOE's Learning Systems Team in the development of the SSIP and will further engage Maine DOE's general education partners by consulting with the newly-hired elementary-school math content specialist. Additionally, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, a member of the SSIP Workgroup, will continue to attend regular meetings of the Learning Systems Team to facilitate the exchange of ideas and collaborate on work that benefits all Maine students.

Additionally, Maine DOE's Focus and Priority School program administrators and coaches will play a significant role in the implementation and evaluation of the model of coaching and fidelity assessment that will be used for the Math4ME initiative. The relevant areas for improvement within and across the systems include an aligned practice of coaching that is targeted specifically to the needs of special education teachers and general education teachers as they relate to the instruction of students with disabilities. Students receiving special education are general education students first, and their general education teachers require knowledge of inclusive teaching strategies to successfully educate these students in their classrooms to the fullest extent possible. Additionally, special education teachers are in need of instructional strategies for math that exploit areas of strength and support areas of need. Coaching is an evidence-based training practice that has been shown to have the highest training outcomes for knowledge of content, skill implementation, and classroom application when paired with administrative support and data feedback (Joyce & Showers, 2002). As such, Maine DOE is committed to a coaching model that supports inclusive teaching strategies for general educators and increasing understanding of effective math instructional practices by special educators.

Summary: The relative areas of strength within and across systems include general education and special education initiatives and activities that have been increasingly aligned. The increased communication and collaboration of teams embodies multiple reform initiatives addressing all students, including students with disabilities. Maine's ongoing implementation of proficiency-based education initiatives, differentiated accountability systems of supports, educator effectiveness initiatives, and other educational reforms cannot occur with teams working on their own. Cross-collaboration and cross-communication between and among teams ensure all students are considered as general education students first, and the professional development activities currently offered, even when focused on students with disabilities, have intended outcomes for all students. Supports that teachers and educational leaders need to meet high expectations for all students are provided in multiple ways and are communicated to the field on a regular basis.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

(2a) Implementation Support for LEAs. With stakeholder input, the Maine Department of Education (DOE) has chosen to implement an evidence-based professional development program in the teaching of foundations of math (Math4ME) in selected schools as its primary SSIP improvement strategy.

In the summer of 2015, Maine DOE began investigating published research on the Foundations of Math professional development program and discussed its empirical basis with two developers of the program: Chris Cain, an Associate Professor of Education at Mars Hill University, and Valerie Faulkner, an Assistant Professor of Education at North Carolina State University. Maine DOE personnel also discussed the program's promise with Maine's stakeholder group, whose members expressed a high level of support, and with federally-contracted technical assistance personnel, including Mary Watson, a former Special Education Director in North Carolina, a state that had already seen a great deal of success as a result of the program. A significant portion of the Foundations of Math training focuses on components of number sense: 1) Algebraic and Geometric Thinking, 2) Quantity/Magnitude, 3) Numeration, 4) Equality, 5) Base Ten, 6) Form of a Number, and 7) Proportional Reasoning (Cain, Doggett, Faulkner, & Hale, 2007). These content components are integrated with evidence-based teaching practices to increase the conceptual coherence of math instruction, and there is evidence that the training increases teachers' knowledge of math content and pedagogy and that students have benefitted from receiving math instruction from teachers who have received the training (Faulkner, Cain, Hale, & Doggett, 2006; Faulkner & Cain, 2013). For example, comparing end-of-grade math assessments, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction verified that students with disabilities who were taught by teachers who participated in the training made greater gains than students with disabilities who were taught by teachers who had not participated in the training (see Attachment 2).

After obtaining consensus with stakeholders on the value of implementing the professional development program in Maine, Maine DOE contracted with two developers of the program, Chris Cain and Valerie Faulker, to provide the training to teachers of math at selected schools. Schools were selected using a competitive application process. Maine DOE advertised the opportunity to participate in the Math4ME training to all public LEAs in Maine, and the selection of LEAs was based on their responses to the application questions (see Attachment 3 for application rubric). In their applications, LEAs described how their needs fit with the professional development, and they addressed their readiness and capacity to institute evidence-based improvement practices in their schools. Specifically, Maine DOE's selection of LEAs was based on evaluation of the following factors, which LEAs addressed in their applications:

- Rationale/description of need for the professional development
- Readiness to implement improvement practices, including support for ongoing coaching of teachers after initial training
- Leadership structure and infrastructure available to sustain the improvement strategies
- Evidence of collaboration between special education and regular education teachers, including a description of how special education and regular education teachers will continue to collaborate for long-term implementation of the improvement strategies.

Based on these criteria, in the fall of 2015 Maine DOE selected 5 schools spanning the school districts of Auburn, Lewiston, MSAD 52, and the Auburn site of the Margaret Murphy Centers for Children (a special purpose private school) as the first cohort of schools to engage in the training. In addition to strong valuation of the LEAs' readiness, leadership, needs, and the other factors that influenced selection, the selected LEAs are geographically adjacent in a relatively urban area, and there is a high degree of student transience between them. Therefore, students transferring between the schools of the selected LEAs would be more likely to receive consistent math instruction.

The Math4ME training will begin in the summer of 2016 with five days of on-site training and outside reading covering math content and evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Participants will be volunteer special education teachers and volunteer regular education teachers from the selected LEAs. The expected number of participants in this training is 4–7 teachers from each of the 5 selected schools for a total of 20–35 participants. As mentioned above, a significant portion of the training focuses on number sense, and the content components are integrated with evidence-based teaching practices designed to increase the conceptual coherence of math instruction.

After training, Maine DOE will support the LEAs to ensure continuous implementation and fidelity of practice in several ways. Maine DOE will contract with one of the LEAs to provide a teacher who will assume the position of Teacher-Leader. This individual will receive additional training on the fidelity of practice of the Math4ME program and will be responsible for fidelity observations and coaching of the trained teachers across all selected LEAs. The Teacher-Leader will also coordinate the data collections necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program for the LEA cohort. Additionally, Maine DOE will contract with the University of Maine to provide external evaluators for the project. The evaluators will create data-collection instruments, conduct teacher interviews, and engage in other evaluation activities (see the Evaluation Section, Component 3 of this document). Collaboratively, the University of Maine evaluators, Maine DOE, and the Teacher-Leader will coordinate fidelity of practice assessments, formative evaluations of student progress, and teacher interviews throughout the school-year. Additionally, end-of-grade math assessments will be evaluated at the end of the school year. Evaluation will be ongoing for the initial cohort of students of trained teachers (e.g., following student math performance in the years that follow), and plans for scale-up include training the majority of teachers of math (both general educators and special educators) in the selected LEAs. During scale-up, LEAs will continue to receive the same supports that were provided during the first year of the program.

Given that favorable results are seen for the first cohort of LEAs, Maine DOE envisions that long-term scale-up will include delivery of the Math4ME training to other LEAs across the state. Additionally, pending evaluation of the program's effectiveness, education faculty members from the Farmington and Orono campuses of the University of Maine have expressed an interest in partnering with Maine DOE in scale-up activities that include integrating components of the training into the course curriculum for education majors at the University of Maine.

(2b) Implementation Timelines and Improvement Strategies. Maine's stakeholders have contributed consistently and substantially to the interpretation of data analyses, infrastructure analyses, selection and modification of the SIMR, and the form and direction of the implementation plan more generally. The goal for each stakeholder meeting has been to work as partners toward an intended outcome. In some cases the purpose of the meeting was to brainstorm and share perspectives. In others, the intent was to reach consensus on a general course of action or specific activities. In each case, Maine DOE personnel and technical assistance personnel presented information and facilitated discussion, and members of the stakeholder group partnered with Maine DOE personnel to make decisions. From these meetings, Maine stakeholders and Maine DOE have agreed to the following improvement activities, roles, goals, and timelines for first-year implementation:

- Implementation Activity 1: Math4ME Training of Initial Cohort of Teachers
Short-Term Timeline: 5 days of training; completed during summer, 2016
Coordinator/Facilitator: Chris Cain and Valerie Faulkner
Participants: 4–7 teachers from each of the 5 selected schools for a total of 20–35 participants.
Resources: State/IDEA funds

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Assessment of Fidelity: Pre-training–Post-training to assess changes in teachers' knowledge of math content and pedagogy.

Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up: Training of additional teacher cohorts and Teacher-Leaders.

• Implementation Activity 2: Fidelity Training for Teacher-Leader

Short-Term Timeline: Completed during summer, 2016

Coordinator/Facilitator: Chris Cain and Valerie Faulkner

Participants: One individual from one of the 5 selected schools.

Resources: State/IDEA funds

Assessment of Fidelity: Post-Training assessment on fidelity of practice

Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up Activities: Obtain Teacher-Leader for each new cohort of LEAs trained

• Implementation Activity 3: Fidelity Checks/Coaching of Trained Teachers

Short-Term Timeline: 3 coaching visits during the 2016-17 school year for each trained teacher

Coordinator/Facilitator: Teacher-Leader

Participants: Each trained teacher will be coached

Resources: State/IDEA funds

Assessment of Fidelity: Fidelity evaluations will be completed by the Teacher-Leader

Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up Activities: 3 coaching visits per year for trained teachers in subsequent cohorts

Maine DOE will continue to schedule meetings with the full stakeholder group as appropriate throughout the length of the SSIP. These meetings will be used to report implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit feedback from stakeholders, and address any ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. In addition to the full meetings, members of the stakeholder group may join smaller more content-specific groups that will communicate more frequently in person or by email to discuss specific areas of interest. Additionally, an SSIP Implementation Leader from Maine DOE will be responsible for providing updates to stakeholders, evaluators, and all interested persons via an emailed newsletter, and the person will serve as a point of contact for communicating needs, concerns, and updates between the LEA Teacher-Leader, the external evaluators, members of the stakeholder group, and other Maine DOE personnel.

(2c) Resources and Stewardship for Sustained Implementation. The Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup was developed to translate the ideas that arise in discussions with stakeholders, technical assistance personnel, evaluators, trainers, and others into suggestions and formulate decision points regarding the improvement plan. The workgroup consists of the State Special Education Director, the SSIP Coordinator, the Federal Programs Coordinator, the Special Purpose Private School Coordinator, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, and the IDEA Part B Data Manager. The Regular Education/Special Education Liaison was hired by the Special Services division of Maine DOE to engage in activities of Maine DOE's Learning Systems Teams and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) initiatives that support scale-up and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices. The Learning Systems Team includes the Standards and Instructional Support Team and the School Improvement Team, and these teams participate in initiatives that cross divisions within Maine DOE. The Learning Systems Team includes a newly-hired math specialist for elementary grade levels, and this individual will be invited to participate in the initial Math4ME training as an introduction to the SSIP work. The SSIP Workgroup and Learning Systems Team members will meet regularly to discuss the ways in which Maine DOE and other state agencies can best support LEAs in scale-up and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices, including the Math4ME initiative.

Additionally, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) submitted for the next competitive grant cycle includes a goal focused on state capacity-building and scale-up for evidence-based math instruction. In the application, SPDG funding has been budgeted to support Math4ME training for additional teachers and Teacher-Leaders, ongoing coaching and fidelity assessments, evaluations of program effectiveness, and other activities that support the SSIP through 2020. State/IDEA funds also will be used to maintain external evaluation by the University of Maine for scale-up activities that take place between the first year of Math4ME training and 2018.

Maine also has engaged education faculty members at the University of Maine who have expressed an interest in partnering with Maine DOE to integrate components of the Math4ME training into the curriculum of education majors at the University of Maine, which will have a far-reaching influence in sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math across Maine. To facilitate this partnership and efforts to improve teacher per-service preparation for teaching math to students with disabilities, the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup will invite a representative from the Standards and Instructional Support team within Maine DOE to serve on the SSIP Workgroup and work with the stakeholders.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

(3a) Evaluation Objectives and Components. The development of Maine's evaluation plan was guided by the theory of action (Attachment 4) and the objectives outlined in the SSIP logic model (Attachment 5). The theory of action and logic model outline a pathway to sustainable evidence-based math instruction to improve math proficiency for students with disabilities in Maine. The evaluation elements aligned with implementation activities are noted in the Implementation section (Component 2) of this document. The following evaluation activities are aligned to each of the outcomes/objectives listed in the logic model:

- Outcome 1 (short-term): Increased knowledge of fundamental math content and pedagogy for Teacher Leader. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The Teacher-Leader will demonstrate increased knowledge of math content and evidence-based pedagogy as measured by pre- and post-training assessments developed by the external evaluator.
- Outcome 2 (short-term): Increased knowledge of fundamental math content and pedagogy for trained teachers. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The teachers who participate in training will demonstrate increased knowledge of math content and evidence-based pedagogy as measured by pre- and post-training assessments developed by the external evaluator.
- Outcome 3 (Medium-term): Increased skill of trained teachers in utilizing evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The Teacher-Leader will conduct 2 to 3 fidelity observations/coaching with each trained teacher during the course of the school year following the teachers' training. The rubric used for fidelity evaluations will be designed by external evaluators at the University of Maine in collaboration with the trainers/developers of the professional development and the Teacher-Leader. Additionally, each teacher will be interviewed by an external evaluator from the University of Maine at least once during the school year to assess the degree to which teachers feel their practices have improved and to gauge teachers' assessments of the benefits of the training and fidelity observations/coaching.

- Outcome 4 (Medium-term): Increased number of students with disabilities exposed to evidence-based teaching practices regarding fundamental concepts in math. Data/Evaluation of Progress: Maine DOE will monitor the number of teachers trained from the initial cohort through scale-up with subsequent cohorts.

- o The goal for year 1 of the initial cohort is to train 50% of the special education teachers and 8% of the regular education teachers in the selected schools, for a total of 22 teachers.
- o The goal for year 2 of the initial cohort is to train at least 20 new teachers in the selected schools such that 90% of the special education teachers and 16% of the regular education teachers are trained by the end of year 2.
- o The year 3 goal is a scale-up of the initiative beyond the initial cohort. The new cohort will consist of 5 new schools in new LEAs. For the new cohort, the year 1 and year 2 goals for the number of teachers trained will be the same as the year 1 and year 2 goals of the first cohort.

Progress toward these goals will be monitored and, with stakeholder input, targets will be adjusted when appropriate. Additionally, the Teacher-Leader will provide Maine DOE and the external evaluators with counts of the number of students being taught by teachers who received the math training each year.

- Outcome 5 (Long-term): Increased proficiency in math for elementary-aged students with disabilities in the selected LEAs. Data/Evaluation of Progress: Progress toward improved math proficiency of students in the selected LEAs will be formatively assessed by teachers during the course of each school year. Because formative assessments of students at one LEA may differ from formative assessments of students at other LEAs, it will be essential to consider student performance in the context of the specific school and teacher. Therefore, analysis of formative performance data will be informed by input from the teachers; teacher interviews by external evaluators will serve to gather teacher input and contextual information, and they will also provide an opportunity to illuminate outcomes that would not be discernable from performance assessments alone (e.g., changes in students' enthusiasm for math, completion of homework). Summative assessments will consist of the

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

math section of end-of-grade statewide assessments. Additionally, external evaluators from the University of Maine will conduct surveys of the parents of children taught by the trained teachers to track potential improvements in the students' attitudes toward math and other potential outcomes that would not be captured by examination scores alone.

As described above, Maine DOE's plan for scale-up beyond the initial cohort consists of increasing the number of trained teachers in additional LEAs and, as a corollary, increasing the number of students receiving evidence-based math instruction. Scale-up will also consist of the training of additional Teacher-Leaders to perform fidelity assessments and coaching of trained teachers at participating LEAs.

(3b) Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluation. Stakeholders have been integral in the selection of the evaluation activities listed above and will continue to be involved in the evaluation of progress toward all goals of the initiative. In a stakeholder meeting held on October 22, 2015, stakeholders considered the proposed changes to the SIMR and improvement activities and were very supportive of the changes. Additionally, in the October, 2015 meeting and a meeting held on January 28, 2016, stakeholders and Maine DOE collaborated to align the theory of action and logic model with the new improvement activities. In both of these meetings, stakeholders also suggested activities that they believed would be essential for promoting the initiative. These suggestions included engaging the Maine Parent Federation to offer informational sessions for families and teachers at the selected LEAs, distributing newsletters with progress updates for stakeholders, teachers, and parents, holding a publicized 'kick-off' of the initiative, and engaging in celebrations of success with the LEAs.

Additionally, stakeholders suggested evaluation elements that they thought were essential to monitoring the initiative. These suggestions included formative and summative assessments of students' math knowledge, feedback from teachers regarding their use of new pedagogical strategies and techniques in the classroom and their perceptions of students' responses to those techniques, parent feedback and perceptions of their children regarding changes in attitudes toward math, changes in students' completion of math homework, and other outcomes that would not be discernable from assessments alone.

The Maine DOE will continue to update stakeholders on implementation progress and emerging evaluation data and will schedule meetings through 2017 as appropriate. Additionally, members of the stakeholder group have been asked to indicate if they are interested in creating smaller committees that would address more specific topics or activities. For example, some members have indicated that they would be particularly interested in being involved in the planning and monitoring of activities associated with public promotion and dissemination of information about the initiative, others expressed a specific interest in evaluation activities. Therefore, we expect that, in addition to meetings of the full stakeholder group, content-specific stakeholder committees and Maine DOE personnel will communicate regularly via email and ad-hoc meetings.

(3c) Data Collection and Analysis. Stakeholders, Maine DOE personnel and external evaluators from the University of Maine discussed and agreed on the advantages of gathering within-school-year formative and end-of-grade summative data based on quantitative assessments of students' math knowledge and qualitative data on student outcomes that are not discernable from assessment scores alone. Formative assessments of students' math knowledge will be conducted periodically throughout the school year, and the data will be collected by the Teacher-Leader and submitted to the University of Maine external evaluators for analysis. Because formative assessments of students at one LEA may differ from formative assessments of students at other LEAs, it will be essential to consider student performance in the context of the specific school and teacher. Therefore, analysis of formative performance data will be informed by input from the teachers; teacher interviews by external evaluators will serve to gather teacher input and contextual information, and they will also provide an opportunity to illuminate outcomes that would not be discernable from performance assessments alone (e.g., changes in students' enthusiasm for math, completion of homework).

All student-level data, including assessment scores used for proficiency calculations, are entered and maintained in the State Student Information System. The Maine DOE Special Services Data Manager will de-identify the end-of-grade math performance data, other than student number, which would be required for tracking students across grades, and submit the data to the external evaluators for analysis. In the data submission, the Data Manager will indicate the students with disabilities who received math instruction from the trained teachers so comparisons can be made between these students and those in the same LEA who received instruction from teachers that did not participate in the training. Additional analyses will examine the proficiency percentages and average scaled scores of students with disabilities who received math instruction from the trained teachers as compared to all other LEA proficiency percentages and scaled scores of students with disabilities across the state. In addition to the end-of-year comparisons, the proficiency categories and scaled scores of students of trained teachers will be followed across grade levels in subsequent years and comparisons will be made between these students' scores and those of other students with disabilities in the same grades across the state.

(3d) Evaluating Progress Toward the SIMR. Formative and summative data regarding the success of implementation activities and progress toward the SIMR will be reviewed by external evaluators as it becomes available. External evaluators will share their analyses with the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup, and with stakeholders in face-to-face meetings and periodic newsletters. Evaluation data will also be presented and discussed in meetings of the subgroup of stakeholders comprising the evaluation committee. Suggestions and concerns that arise from such discussions will be communicated to the full stakeholder group. Progress toward implementation goals and the SIMR will be assessed using the criteria outlined in Section (3a) above and will be communicated to stakeholders in meetings and newsletters. Based on assessments of implementation and progress toward the SIMR, decisions regarding modifications to implementation or evaluation activities, timelines, and goals will be made by the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup as informed by suggestions solicited from the full stakeholder group and the external evaluators.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Maine has benefitted greatly from the assistance provided by multiple OSEP-funded technical assistance agencies. Personnel from the IDEA Data Center and the National Center for Systemic Improvement have provided indispensable guidance, consultation, and coordination through all steps of Maine's development of the SSIP, and Maine will continue to benefit greatly from their assistance. Moving forward to Phase III, consultation on continued stakeholder engagement, infrastructure development, alignment of resources, and technical assistance regarding implementation science and best-practices for scale-up will be particularly valuable. Additionally, Maine hopes to continue to draw on the experience of technical assistance personnel who have administered or consulted in the service of similar initiatives for systemic change in other states, particularly as those experiences relate to addressing potential implementation barriers.

At this time, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is the primary financial resource that Maine DOE plans to leverage to support the Math4ME training, post-training fidelity assessments and coaching in LEAs, evaluation of outcomes, and long-term scale-up. However, because the SPDG is a competitive grant that supports diverse initiatives beyond the SSIP, support from OSEP in the form of a non-competitive grant targeted specifically for SSIP implementation and scale-up would be a great benefit. The assurance of SSIP funding would assist with long-term planning for capacity-building and scale-up.

Additionally, stakeholder assistance and support has been and will continue to be crucial to the success of the SSIP. Maine DOE will continue to meet with the full stakeholder group to examine implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit stakeholder feedback, and address ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. An important function of the group will be to proactively advise on how to engage and garner support from the field—teachers, administrators, students, and parents—in each new LEA cohort, broadcast successes, and build interest and enthusiasm for the initiative across the state.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Maine's Phase III SSIP and supporting materials are contained in the attachments.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Janice E. Breton

Title: State Director of Special Services

Email: janice.breton@maine.gov

Phone: 207-624-6676